UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,495	/616,495 07/09/2003 Jordan T. Bourilkov		08935-292001 / M-5028	9718
26161 FISH & RICHA	7590 05/28/200 ARDSON PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1022		PARSONS, THOMAS H		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/616,495	BOURILKOV ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	THOMAS H. PARSONS	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	causo
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a on NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. $oxed{oxed}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-39</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>5-9</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/PATRICK RYAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795			

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicants' argue that Bean et al. does not show "an adapter comprising a member including appropriate mating fittings on a common surface." Applicants' further argue, "In Bean, one of the terminals 110' contacts the anode of a battery and an opposing terminal 110', e.g., in a different, albeit parallel plane, contacts the cathode of the battery, as is depicted in Figures 2 and 3A or FIG. 11. The two contacts shown in Figures 4A, B contact one of the terminals of a battery but do not suggest the arrangement of adapter comprises a member including appropriate mating fittings on a common surface to allow the member to connect to a battery or a source of fuel for a fuel cell system ...," as claimed in claim 1.

In response, the argument is not commensurate in scope with the claim. The claim does not require that both anode and cathode contacts be on a common surface. The claim is directed to a member with appropriate matting fittings on a common surface to allow the member to connect to a battery (anode or cathode contact) or a fuel cell

Applicants' argue, "Nowhere in Bourilkov et al. (US 2004/0253500) does Bourilkov et al. disclose the claimed "adapter." Rather, Bourilkov et al. discloses an interconnect 20 housed in the compartment 14. Accordingly, claims 33-39 are not anticipated by Bourilkov et al.

In response, bBecause the member of Bourikov et al. is structurally the same as that instantly disclosed, the member anticipates an adapter.

.